

REMARKS

General remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-12 have been amended. New claims 13-18 have been added. Claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the remarks presented herein.

*Objections to the Claims*

Claims 1-8 have been objected to because of alleged informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7 and 8 as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

*Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph*

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have editorially amended claim 2 to improve clarity. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on at least page 17, lines 17-21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims directed to carrier wave computer data signals embedded in a carrier wave are statutory subject matter. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has provided an illustrative example of a carrier wave claim to be statutory subject matter. See Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions, page 38 (March 1996). Since the USPTO has admitted that such claims are acceptable, and moreover has recommended the use of precisely such a format in drafting claims, the USPTO should not reject

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/666,561  
Attorney Docket No. Q77600

claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Iwamura

Claims 1 and 3-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Iwamura (U.S. Patent Number 5,883,621). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the claimed invention relates to:

A status notification apparatus for notifying the status of a second information processing apparatus in a first information processing apparatus transmitting/receiving information to/from the second information processing apparatus and having a display unit which can display the information, comprising:

an inquiry device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and making an inquiry about whether the second information processing apparatus has a function of transmitting/receiving the information; and

a notification device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and starting the notification upon confirmation by the inquiry device that the second information processing apparatus has the function.

The Examiner maintains that Iwamura discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Iwamura does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a status notification apparatus “having a display unit which can display the information [transmitted/received to/from the second information processing apparatus]”, and which also comprises “a notification device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and starting the notification upon confirmation by the inquiry device that the second information

processing apparatus has the function,” as recited by claim 1. Iwamura only discloses a single display device that displays a topology map of icons to indicate various components which make up the system. There is no teaching or suggestion in Iwamura of a display unit which can display transmitted/received information, as well as a notification device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and starting the notification upon confirmation by the inquiry device that the second information processing apparatus has the function. Iwamura’s display device does not teach or suggest a status notification apparatus with all of its elements as recited in claim 1, and in particular, Iwamura’s generation of a topology map on a display device does not teach or suggest both a display unit and a notification device as claimed.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, Applicants’ claim 1 distinguishes over Iwamura. Applicants’ claims 3, 9 and 10 are related independent claims which recite similar elements, and are distinguished over Iwamura for analogous reasons. Applicants’ claims {5 and 7} and {4, 6 and 8} are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 3 respectively, which as established above, distinguish over Iwamura. Therefore, claims 4-8 are distinguished over Iwamura for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

#### Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 13-18 to provide more varied scope of protection for the present invention. Claims 13-18 are allowable based on their dependencies as well as for their additionally recited features. That is, the cited references do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*: that “the notification device is separately provided as an indicator in the status notification apparatus, and a ready state can be known from the notification device irrespective of the on/off state of the display unit,” as recited by claims 13, 14, 17 and 18; or that “the notification process generates an indication of a ready state irrespective of the on/off state of the display unit,” as recited by claims 15 and 16.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/666,561  
Attorney Docket No. Q77600

Conclusion and request for telephone interview

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/

Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

Date: December 8, 2005